



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,564	10/11/2001	Paul G. Allen	10003.001100 (digeo 129)	7500
32641	7590	06/17/2005		
DIGEO, INC C/O STOEL RIVES LLP 201 SOUTH MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100 ONE UTAH CENTER SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111				
			EXAMINER WILSON, JACQUELINE B	
			ART UNIT 2612	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/975,564

Applicant(s)

ALLEN ET AL.

Examiner

Jacqueline Wilson

Art Unit

2612

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-19,21-24 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-19,21-24 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Please see new ground of rejection below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 11, 14, 15 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rye et al. (US 6,744,463) in view of Monroe (US 2003/0169335).**

Regarding Claim 1, Rye et al teaches a system for switching between a plurality of video cameras (12a-12d) without a multiplexing device such that a video signal from only one of the plurality of video cameras is output at any given time (see abstract), the system comprising a camera controller (38), a plurality of physically separate addressable power switches (col.3, lines 34-38), wherein each addressable power switch is coupled to and controls power applied to a corresponding video camera,

Art Unit: 2612

wherein each addressable power switches comprises a wireless receiver (24) for receiving a control signal to either supply or switch off power to the corresponding video camera (col. 5, lines 3+), an output device (34), and a switch controller (40) controlled by the camera controller for addressing the plurality of addressable power switches, wherein the switch controller comprises a wireless transmitter (col. 3, lines 62+) for transmitting the control signals to the addressable power switches such that power is applied to only a single selected video camera (col. 3, lines 62- col. 4, line 20).

However, Rye et al does not specifically disclose the wireless receivers are different.

Monroe teaches that it is notoriously well known in the art to include a plurality of wireless transmitters (referred to as transceivers fig. 3b; see also fig 1 wherein the transceivers are located within each aircraft) for sending and receiving information to a remote location. This provides easy mobility of accessing the camera as well as receiving information to a designated location. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use different wireless receivers for manipulating the camera from a remote location.

Regarding Claim 2, Rye et al teaches wherein at least one addressable power switch is embedded with a corresponding video camera (18a is an "integral part of a whole" of the camera device).

Regarding Claim 4, Rye teaches the wireless transmitter is configured to transmit radio frequency signals to the wireless receivers, and wherein the wireless receiver are configured to receive radio frequency signals from the wireless transmitter (col. 3, lines 64-67).

Regarding Claim 5, Rye et al teaches the switch controller is integrated into the camera controller (element 40 is integrated with the camera controller 38).

Regarding Claim 10, Rye et al teaches the plurality of video cameras comprises wireless transmitters (14a-14d; col. 3, lines 24+) for sending video signals to the output device, and wherein the output device comprises a wireless receiver (30) for receiving video signals from the plurality of video cameras (see fig. 1; col. 3, lines 42-50).

Claim 11 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 1 with the further limitation of a memory configured with a camera control process. Rye et al teaches the camera controller comprises a memory (col. 4, lines 21+), which inherently includes a communication bus for transmitting command codes to the switch controller for the purpose supplying addressing the specific camera for operation.

Claim 14 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 1. (see rejection of Claim 1 above.)

Regarding Claim 15, Rye et al teaches the switch controller comprises a decoder for decoding the command codes to generate the control signals (col. 3, lines 62+ and col. 4, lines 21+)

Regarding Claim 26, Rye et al teaches at least one addressable power switch is to supply or switch off power from a DC source (col. 3, lines 42+).

**4. Claims 6, 7 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rye et al (US 6,744,463) in view of Ogasawara (US 6,543,052).**

Regarding Claim 6, Rye et al fails to teach the camera controller is integrated into customer premises equipment that is communicatively coupled to a cable network. However, Ogasawara'052 teaches a set-top box (STB) which is coupled to cable providers, Internet Service Provider (ISP), to name a few (col. 3, lines 52+), and is also capable of controlling various peripheral devices such as a camera printer, etc. (see fig. 1). Ogasawara'052 teaches that by controlling the peripheral devices using a centralized control through the STB helps facilitate their access and management (col. 4, lines 1-3). This would be advantageous in Rye et al for controlling the plurality cameras by using an STB such that all devices may be controlled along with a variety of other devices and providers. The STB also gives the system versatility by including cable connections as well as Internet service for transmitting and receiving video images from remote locations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to integrate the controller of Rye et al into a customer premises equipment (such as a STB) that is communicatively coupled to a cable network for producing a multifaceted device capable of transmitting and receiving information.

Claim 7 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 6. (See rejection of Claim 6 above.)

Claims 16 and 17 are analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 6. (See rejection of Claim 6 above.)

Claim 18 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 6. (See rejection of Claim 6 above.)

Art Unit: 2612

5. **Claims 8, 9, 12-13, ~~16~~ and 19, 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rye et al, Ogasawara'052, in view of Bellman, Jr. et al. (4,831,438).**

Regarding Claims 8 and 9, Rye et al fails to teach an authentication process limits commands accepted to only authorized commands or an encryption process provides security to video signals transmitted from the camera controller to a remote access controller. However, Bellman, Jr teaches that it is notoriously well known in the art to have a surveillance system that includes an authentication process (col. 4, lines 39+) and an encryption process (fig. 1, 470). This prevents unauthorized activation of the system or interception of the surveillance information. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Rye et al with Bellman, Jr for providing secure access to the surveillance system by using authentication and encryption processes.

Claims 12 and 13 are analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 8 and 9. Although, Bellman, Jr fails to specifically teach a memory is configured with the authentication process and encryption process, one having ordinary skill would recognize that it would be essential to store these processes in a storage area for storing program codes needed to activate each process for securing access in surveillance systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have the memory for storing an authentication and encryption processes.

Claim 19 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 11-13. (Claim 19 is a method of Claims 11-13. See rejection of Claims 11-13 above.)

Claim 21 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claims 3 and 4. (See rejection of Claims 3 and 4 above.)

Regarding Claim 22, Rye teaches the plurality of cameras are placed about a premises (such as a public building or locations in or outside of a residence; col. 1, lines 11-31) and wherein the command is received from a remote system (38) within the premises of the customer (location within the home).

Regarding Claim 23, Rye et al teaches the plurality of cameras are placed about a premises of a customer (such as a public building or locations in or outside of a residence; col. 1, lines 11-31), and the command is received from a remote system outside the premises of the customer (such as a security station).

Claim 24 is analyzed and discussed with respect to Claim 19. (See rejection of Claim 19 above.)

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not



Art Unit: 2612


mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacqueline Wilson whose telephone number is (571) 272-7322. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm (alternate Fridays off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on (571) 272-7308. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JW  
05/31/05

  
AUNG MOE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER